

**-- REMARKS --**

**Claims 1-6**. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Farah objected to and rejected pending claims 1-6 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each objection and rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.112:

- A.** Examiner Farah objected to claims 1-6 for lacking an antecedent basis for several limitations

The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 herein to provide an antecedent basis for the terms “mercury”, “UV” and “transparent plastics sheets”. Withdrawal of the objection of claims 1-6 is therefore respectfully requested.

- B.** Examiner Farah rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,835,400 to *Wolff* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,764,501 to *Ganz*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Farah’s remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-6 over the *Wolff* in view of *Ganz*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read the *Wolff* and *Ganz*. To warrant this §103(a) rejection of claims 1-6, all the claim limitations recited in claims 1-6 must be taught or suggested by the combination of *Wolff* and *Ganz*. See, MPEP §2143. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 because, among other things, *Wolff* and *Ganz* in combination fails to teach or suggest “a plurality of mercury vapor lamps emitting a UV light, or a plurality of transparent plastics sheets covering the mercury lamps, are doped or covered with one or more organic or inorganic fluorescent dyes that partially absorb the UV light emitted by the mercury lamps, covert it into a longer-wave yellowish light, and thus produce a bright, white light” as recited in independent claim 1.

As to the traversal, *Wolff* fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1 as correctly recognized by Examiner Farah. Moreover, a careful review of *Ganz* reveals a failure by *Ganz* to teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1.

Specifically, *Ganz* teaches several embodiments of a light source for a treating atherosclerotic vascular disease through light sterilization. FIG. 2 of *Ganz* illustrates a lamp 38 serving as the light source, wherein lamp 38 can be a low pressure mercury lamp. See, *Ganz* at column 4, line 31 to column 5, line 25. FIG. 5 of *Ganz* illustrates a tube 50 containing two chemically reactive chemiluminescence liquids 58 and 60 serving as the light source, wherein a fluorescer (e.g., perylene) may be used. See, *Ganz* at column 5, line 40 to column 7, line 2. FIG. 6 of *Ganz* illustrates a light distribution head 74 containing two chemically reactive chemiluminescence liquids 80 and 84 serving as the light source, wherein a fluorescer (e.g., perylene) may be used. See, *Ganz* at column 5, line 40 to column 7, line 2. FIG. 7 of *Ganz* illustrates a capsule 94 containing an electroluminescent chemical 98 serving as the light source based on electric current flowing through chemical 98 via electrodes 100 and 102. See, *Ganz* at column 7, lines 36-57. FIG. 8 of *Ganz* illustrates a LED 115 serving as the light source. See, *Ganz* at column 7, line 58 to column 8, line 23.

A careful review of each embodiment of *Ganz* reveals a failure of *Ganz* to teach or suggest any type of doping or covering of lamp 38 with an organic or inorganic fluorescent dye that partially absorbs the UV light emitted by lamp 38, converting it into a longer-wave yellowish light, and thus producing a bright, white light. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolff* in view of *Ganz* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-6 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2-6 are allowable over *Wolff* in view of *Ganz* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over the *Wolff*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolff* in view of *Ganz* is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claims 7-12.** The Applicant asserts that art of record, particularly *Wolff* and *Ganz*, fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, “a mercury vapor lamp emitting a UV light, or a transparent plastics sheet covering the mercury lamp is doped or covered with one or more organic or inorganic fluorescent dyes that partially absorb the UV light emitted by the mercury lamp, covert it into a longer-wave yellowish light, and thus produce a bright, white light” as recited in independent claim 7.

An allowance of claims 7-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

**SUMMARY**

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Farah is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **September 5, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,  
THOMAS JUSTEL

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510  
Phone: (914) 333-9669

---

Frank Keegan  
Registration No. 50,145  
Attorney for Applicant

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

---

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant